

Domingo Tellez,)
)
) Plaintiff,)
)
) v.) **ORDER AND OPINION**
)
)
) Primetals Technologies USA, LLC,)
)
)
) Defendant.)
)
 _____)

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or

modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s determination that Defendant’s motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s third cause of action (ECF No. 23) should be denied. Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 32). Defendant’s motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s Third Cause of Action for FLSA retaliation (ECF No. 23) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
United States District Judge

November 1, 2018
Charleston, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.